A Steel Magnate Pleads for Peace and Co-Existence, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 25 JULY 11, 1953 5 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Eisenhower's Air-Conditioned Answer

The British and French emissaries in Washington this week-end for the Foreign Ministers Conference would do well to begin by considering the events which occurred here on July 1.

On July 1 the new Republican Administration woke to find itself confronted with (1) what seemed to be an opportunity to make good on all its campaign talk of "liberation" for Soviet-held Eastern Europe and (2) the largest peacetime deficit in U.S. history. The two were linked by more than coincidence. Even to dabble in intervention would mean a larger deficit. To concentrate on the deficit, conversely, was to reduce the military means available for that rollback of the Russians which was so recently Mr. Dulles's favorite theme. The Administration decided to concentrate on the deficit.

The decision was evident at the President's press conference that day. The headlines and the cables were full of disorder and unrest in East Europe, much—but far from all of it—exaggerated; the Polish "revolt" seems concocted but the abject "mea culpas" of the East German Communist leaders and the riots which produced them were all too real, as were the dissatisfactions reflected by Czech Communist scoldings, Hungarian Communist reforms and Bulgarian Communist penal sentences for absenteeism.

But when Roscoe Drummond of the Christian Science Monitor asked Eisenhower whether he was considering "any tangible action to support liberation", this was the air-conditioned answer, "A. Well, of course, we had always said we were for free elections in those countries. He did not believe there was any thought of taking any physical action of any kind that could be classed as intervention." There has not been so much caution in the White House since Coolidge.

The President was in no mood for clarion calls. In the House of Representatives that same day, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was reading a letter from General Eisenhower criticizing the tendency of the military to "seek after total or at least disproportionate military protection." The President wrote, "I should like to re-emphasize that our plan for national security, in contrast to earlier programs . . . seeks to avoid the exceedingly costly, demoralizing, short range effort premised upon an imaginary date of maximum danger." This year no Soviet submarines were sighted off the coast in time for the vote on the military appropriations.

On much else the Republican party may be divided, but not on this decision to concentrate upon the deficit. It was a straight party vote by which the House last week passed a budget cutting more than 6 billion dollars from military requests. It was the Democratic party which Symington rallied in the Senate this week with a bitter attack on "the inexperienced Pentagon civilians", "the money-first men", who had dared cut 5 billion from the Air Force budget and question Air Force General Vandenberg's judgment. The millionaire Senator from Missouri was assailing the Republicans for thinking of "money first"; the operating heads of General Motors (Wilson and Kyes) were attacked as inexperienced in production!

In the Senate, with a one-vote margin, the Administration may not be able to prevent amendment of the budget to add the extra $1,175,000,000 asked for the Air Force by Vandenberg. But the signs there, too, indicate a general revulsion against past policies of alarm and intervention. The crass theme implicit in the debate over the new foreign military aid program was that we need friends abroad because we need their bases. There was much sympathy for Gillette of Iowa when that moderate Republican said he was voting against the MSA program this year because "I believe we have lost sight of our goal of peace in our pursuit of the goal of world wide military security." There was much agreement with his warning, "The Soviet government can defeat us without war if we prepare to defend ourselves only against war." Both parties in the Senate showed themselves eager to wind up MSA.

This is an Administration of conservatives not adventurers, at a time when the prevailing mood is one of civilian weariness with military demands. The anxieties of the Republicans, as of the country, are domestic. Once again the chief interest in foreign affairs is the effort to find some place abroad to dump troublesome farm surpluses. The prize for which the two parties contend again as farm prices fall and a new dust bowl spreads is the farm vote; the lack of adequate public grain storage facilities is the issue which may decide the next elections. The Republicans are fighting hard to make some progress toward a balanced budget and a tax cut by November, 1954; the liberation they want is from the shameful necessity to raise the debt limit. The setback which obsesses the Administration was its forced reversal of deflationist policy; the expansion of an already over-inflated credit base so it could borrow six billions last week—an unprecedented sum—in tax anticipation warrants to meet its current bills.

At this juncture the Administration would like nothing better than a new Joshua somehow to make the sun stand still abroad. It does not want to meet with Malenkov, or to risk new talks on Germany, and it wishes Korea North and South would obligingly slip into the sea. The "Wall Street warmongers" now running the show here want peace and quiet. But peace and quiet are what Syngman Rhee is determined they shall not have, and behind Rhee—giving him leverage—is the American military, who see their budgets further menaced by a relaxation of tension. It is this which lies behind the spate of stories from Korea on how helpless the UN forces would be without Syngman Rhee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Steel Magnate's Plea for Peace and Co-Existence

For several years the steel magnate, Ernest T. Weir, whom we all attacked so bitterly during New Deal days when he successfully opposed unionization of Weirton Steel, has been carrying on a campaign for world peace.

The article which follows is made up of excerpts from the new pamphlet he has just issued on his observations abroad during April and May of this year, his fifth such trip since the end of the war. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained by writing his office, 2800 Grant Building, Pittsburgh 19, Pennsylvania.

Weir was sharply critical of Truman cold war policies and supported Eisenhower in the last election. Weir's views are of especial interest because of his long business association with George M. Humphrey, Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury. Weir founded National Steel Company. Humphrey was chairman of its executive committee.

BY ERNEST T. WEIR

The European attitude toward the situation now existing between the Western and Communist worlds may be stated in three sentences:

1. They feel that European nations cannot continue to spend the large amounts presently devoted to defense because they have neither the money nor the credit.
2. They do not think there is any imminent danger of war.
3. They believe the time is ripe for a positive approach to peace . . .

They know that no Western nation would initiate war. Of all other nations, there is only one that has sufficient industrial and military power to even think of war—Russia.

Europeans do not profess to know more about what is going on inside Russia than we do. But they reason that the same forces are at work in Russia and the satellite countries as in the Western nations. Their people, too, know the destruction and suffering of war. They also know that a third war would be far more terrible than the last one.

To assume that these people would willingly undergo such an ordeal is to declare them inhuman. And to assume that Russian leaders would attempt to take the unwilling citizenry of their own and other countries into a war of such magnitude is to ascribe to those leaders a degree of stupidity that they have not yet shown.

Further, although totalitarian governments do not have the same problems of debt and inflation per se, the same effect is produced by utilizing great quantities of material and labor for war production which otherwise could be devoted to improvement of the countries and of living conditions of their peoples . . .

Since Stalin Died

Just as they believe the danger of war is absent from the current situation, Europeans are convinced that a definite possibility of peace is present. For one thing they believe that there has been a significant change in the attitude of Russia since the death of Stalin. None of the present Russian leaders has anything approaching the stature of Stalin in the eyes of the Russian people. The new leaders require time and stable conditions to consolidate their position and win the support of the people. An assured peace would meet their needs to a far greater extent than war or threats of war . . .

I have been unable to see the logic in the position of those persons in the United States who have been so critical of Europe and so opposed to any attempt at negotiation with Russia. The apparent basis of their thinking is that Russia can never be trusted, that she is likely to outsmart us in any negotiations, and that, in any event, an agreement acceptable to Russia could not be acceptable to us—therefore, we do nothing.

Negative Thinking

This is negative thinking. It offers nothing constructive. Its implication is that the United States and the countries of Europe must go on year after year spending huge sums of money and devoting a great part of their productive capacity and manpower to military purposes and go on year after year prepared to meet Communist countries with force of arms whenever our interests clash with theirs anywhere in the world.

That presents a grim prospect which is all the more grim because it inevitably would lead to world war. When nations continue to enlarge their military machines, there is ever present danger that the machines will be used. Of this I am sure. If such thinking becomes the basis for our national course of action, the United States will become a leader without followers . . .

Suppose we just continue the way we are going? What will be the consequences? From a material standpoint alone, the prospect is appalling. The present high cost of government is due chiefly to the cost of defense. Even with continuation of extremely high taxes it is dubious that we can balance our budget. If we cannot, then we are headed in the same direction as the countries of Europe . . . Even the United States cannot continue indefinitely to devote a huge proportion of its wealth and productive capacity to military purposes. If we fail to bring our debt and spending under control our eventual fate will be the same as with every other country that has failed . . .

Property Values and Peace

Parenthetically, it amazes me that there are some people who actually seem afraid of peace. The decline in the stock market that has been taking place for some weeks over the prospects of a Korean truce, for instance, is ridiculous. Everything we own will be worth more if we have genuine peace than if we have war or continuance of the present tension.

We have become so accustomed to a war economy that some people think we must have it to sustain employment and production. The plain fact is that war production is economic waste. Progress is not built on waste. All the great advances in human history have come in times of peace. If peace can be established, the prospects for development of the world economy are so great that there is not an individual anywhere who will not benefit . . ."

HAPPY ½ BIRTHDAY

The Weekly is six months old today. We thank our readers for their support and for their many kind letters. Growth has been steady and encouraging. One way you can help while on vacation is to pass out copies to friends. We will be glad to send you free sample copies in small quantities of this or any particular past issues for the purpose. Just drop a postcard request to 301 E. Capitol Street.

I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY

Independent in The Cause of Peace and Civil Liberty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• *Editor and Publisher*, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 11, 1953 Vol. I, No. 25

COMMENT

Happy Solution

Our heart goes out to the FBI and the Atomic Energy Commission in the case of Robert L. Condon, the California Congressman they barred as a security risk from the atomic weapons test at Las Vegas.

The affair illustrates a weakness in our system of loyalty and security precaution. Congressmen fulfill a far more important function than ordinary government employes, teachers or defense workers yet they are allowed to take office without being cleared by the FBI.

It is argued that Condon was elected by his constituents with full knowledge of past Leftist association. This does not prove Condon's loyalty. It merely casts doubt on the loyalty of his constituents.

The only solution we can see is, admittedly, a radical one. No one should be allowed to *vote* for a member of Congress without first obtaining FBI clearance.

On second thought, since this might prove expensive, perhaps the same result might be achieved by just leaving members of Congress to be picked by J. Edgar Hoover.

Propaganda Day-Dream

This business of disseminating literature abroad as propaganda has its complexities. In the reply sent by John Foster Dulles to Senator Hennings, D., of Missouri, the Secretary of State said he wanted to make sure the United States Information Service "would not disseminate information which might advance the cause of Soviet Communism."

At first blush this would seem clearly to bar the writings of Doxey Wilkerson from U.S.I.S. libraries abroad. Doxey Wilkerson is one of McCarthy's less sensational discoveries. Wilkerson publicly joined the Communist party in June, 1943, as educational director for Maryland, wrote a column for the *Daily Worker*, and published a recruiting pamphlet, "The Negro People and The Communists".

McCarthy likes sitting ducks. Wilkerson has been "investigated" over and over again. As recently as last March he was before the Jenner committee. It is about as difficult to detect traces of communism in Wilkerson as it would be for the Holy Office to detect traces of heresy in the writings of Brann the Iconoclast. When a copy of Wilkerson's "Special Problems of Negro Education" turned up in the USIS library in London, it was duck soup for the Senator.

Should the American government use the taxpayer's money to buy books by a Communist for USIS libraries abroad? As Senatorial rhetoric, the question may seem unanswerable. But I cannot imagine a better piece of propaganda for the United States at this moment than to take a Britisher into the USIS library in London and say, "What's all this about McCarthyism? Here you have a book by a Communist, a Negro Communist, on one aspect of our touchiest problems, made available to readers abroad at our government's expense. Furthermore the book was written for the President's Advisory Commission on Education. Who says America is afraid of free discussion?"

Lest some patriotic reader in London act upon this day-dream, we hasten to warn him that the Wilkerson book got into that one library by accident, that the President's Commission was not Eisenhower's or Truman's but FDR's, that it passed out of existence before the war, that the Wilkerson "book" is really a pamphlet written as a special study ("Staff Study, No. 12") for the Commission, that Wilkerson was not then a Communist and that the book—far from being the bitter and inflammatory work McCarthy made it seem to be—is a scholarly but pedestrian statistical work with conclusions which appear ultra conservative today. Wilkerson did not attack separate segregated schools for Negroes. All he argued for was a "just and equitable" distribution of funds between white and Negro schools in the South.

And anyway the book's off the shelf in London by now.

Thick Plot Thickens

One of the darkest plots ever to come before McCarthy remains veiled in darkness because the Senator's researchers in this hot weather have been slighting their work. Among the authors hauled up before the McCarthy committee last week was the gifted Richard O. Boyer. One of Boyer's books, "The Dark Ship", has been found in a USIS library abroad. Part of this book had originally been printed in *The New Yorker* as a profile of Joe Curran, head of the National Maritime Union. Just about the time the book was going to press Curran broke with the Communists.

In the book as it appeared some last-minute additions about the break differed markedly from the laudatory tone in which the profile had been written. The enthusiasm for Curran had evaporated. A reviewer in *The Nation* (August 9, 1947) referred to the book as illustrating "the occupational hazards confronting a journalist who follows the Communist party line." The reviewer was another of the authors recently favored by the McCarthy book inquiry. The name signed to the review was James A. Wechsler.

Now it is McCarthy's theory that Wechsler has been writing anti-Communist articles (and perhaps even, as one famous question implied, authoring attacks upon himself in the *Daily Worker*) as protective coloration. A fascinating question would have confronted the Great Investigator if his researchers had not missed this item. If Wechsler attacked others (including Boyer) in order more effectively to carry on his own nefarious work for the Party, what was Boyer really doing when he appeared to echo party line? Infiltrating the waterfront for the D.A.R.?

Subversive Geometry

Dr. Julius H. Hlavaty (see "The Case of The Cooperative Teacher" in our issue of March 21), now fighting for reinstatement as teacher of mathematics in the Bronx High School of Science, was one of the authors "purged" from libraries abroad by our house-broken State Department.

"I remember," Dr. Hlavaty writes us, "reading with some interest in your February 28 number that if Velde had his way Lobachevski's paper on non-Euclidean geometry might some day be marked 'subversive'. Today I find that even Euclidean geometry is not safe. The modest little opus of mine which had been banned from the overseas libraries is a 50-page booklet entitled 'Review Digest of Solid Geometry.' Perhaps if I had stuck to Plane Geometry, or better yet, to one dimensional geometry, I might have obtained clearance."

Subtle Candidate

Temus R. Bright, a used car dealer in Baltimore who is also a Republican candidate for Governor of Maryland, unveiled a monument last week-end to McCarthy. This seemed an obvious effort to get the pro-McCarthy vote. But the nature of the monument makes us wonder whether this might not be a more ambivalent vote-getting maneuver. The Associated Press delicately termed the monument a "shaft". But the Baltimore *Sun*, which was on the scene for the unveiling, described it frankly as "an 8-foot high granite tombstone dedicated to Senator McCarthy." We can just see Mr. Bright hauling the anti-McCarthy voter into the back room and whispering, "Why, man, I hate Joe so much I even got his tombstone ready."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Korea Could Be Man's First Peace Preserve

I do not see how Reason can fail to like very much Sen. Knowland's plan for cutting the Korean knot—by setting up the country as a neutral guaranteed by the "great powers."

I hope it is a plan. The suggestion has been exercised in this column in all weather for the past three years. But the weather is more favorable now for a resort to reason, and the Californian, highly placed in our present administration, is in an excellent position to champion the proposal.

The time for great resolves is when we are grown sick and tired of bloodletting, and the time to push for major reforms in human behavior is when the object lesson of futile destruction is fresh before us. To establish the neutrality of Korea by a contract of the powers would snatch one brand from the burning—and might well show us the way back to other and wider undertakings we subscribed to in our elan at the close of the last world war.

The case for making Korea a little "park of peace" for, say, the next hundred years is from all viewpoints strong. Certainly the unfortunate peninsula has served its turn as a battleground; it has been beaten and bombed and blooded from one end to the other. All the new weapons but one have been tried out upon it. A hundred years would be a reasonable time to allow it for repairs.

An extension of this imposed and underwritten neutrality to the whole nation is, one gathers, the essence of Sen. Knowland's plan. The expeditionary armies would withdraw, disarming the native population as they went by repossessing all of the death-dealing weapons which have been brought in and distributed by one side and the other. The 16 divisions we have trained and armed would go back to their rice fields and hat shops, and all the Red divisions that have been trained and supplied by the other side would perforce do likewise. As neutrals the Koreans would need no armed establishment, which obviously they cannot afford, and in time would compose a government satisfactory to themselves by civil means, and prosper.

Thus the intervention of the United Nations would stand up at last as the police action it was declared to be, and the threat at the Yalu which brought the Chinese into the war would be permanently removed. Humanity at large could point to one corner of the earth at least set apart by the most powerful guarantee as a peace preserve.

Sen. Knowland is of the opinion that all of the nations would welcome the creation of the Korean sanctuary and would pledge their word to it. Of course this would mean that our own nation as well as those on "the other side" would have to shake hands all around on the proposition. For example, we would have to shake hands with the Chinese and recognize in them a capacity for good faith—that is a valid kinship in the human family.

And we would have to be prepared for the resurrection of the other peace projects I have mentioned above, which seemed so natural and fair at the end of World War II. For if it is a good thing to solve the Korean problem simply by exempting Korea from the two-worlds line up, and sparing Koreans the necessity of bearing arms, it must follow as a good thing that the neutrality of other nations that have served their time as battlegrounds, and that previously have been snatched from the burning, should be proclaimed by contract and guaranteed by disarmament.

The effort of Japan to cling to her morning-after renunciation of war and of military power would, by the same logic, claim universal respect and support. And the efforts of the victors on both sides to outfit the irresponsible Germans with another war machine would be abandoned for the grand folly that it is.

If the world cannot bring itself to get out from under its arms all at once, it should pass up no opportunity of getting out from under them piecemeal. At this moment, being sated with battle in Korea, it could discharge Korea from guard mount with no pain. It could declare Korea *hors de combat* henceforth, neutral itself and out of bounds for all armies. And it then could begin to add other neutral territories to this bit to cut down the room left on earth for any war.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 7-11-53
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. $5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....

State .....

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED